

Comments and Responses on Public Review Draft of SOCCR/SAP 2.2 (September 2006)

COMMENTS FROM PUBLIC REVIEWERS						AUTHOR'S RESPONSE						
Comment Number	Reviewer ID	Chapter	Page	Line	Comment Text	Acknowledged, but no further response or revisions are required	Revisions have been incorporated as suggested in the comment	Agree, but see "Notes on Response"	Agree, but elaboration is precluded by length limitations	Disagree; see "Notes on Response"	Beyond scope of report/chapter	Notes on Response
II-001	13	Pt II O'view	II-1	22-29	Other portions of the draft have also provided similar comments (e.g., the Executive Summary, p. ES-1, lines 17-29 and line 32 through p. ES-2, line 4 and Chapter 2, Key Findings, p. 2-1, lines 12-17). We question why these statements or information needs repeating in the report, particularly since, while appearing to impart the same information, they are often doing so in a different and not always consistent manner.					X		it seems appropriate for separate chapters in a lengthy report to be able to stand alone, and hence some repetition is likely.
II-002	12	Pt II O'view	II-1	15 ff	This overview provides a very useful summary of accounting and calculations, but does not provide a much-needed overview of the relationship of emissions to human activities. The chapter would be more useful with a discussion of the various ways that emissions are aligned with particular sectors and types of activities, and the implications for these different alignments for accounting and carbon management.			X				reference is made to the subsequent chapters where this is done quite explicitly
II-003	12	Pt II O'view	II-3	27-29	Uncertainties also arise from differences in the accounting and classification of power plants and other emissions sources.			X				see page 6 of this chapter
II-004	13	Pt II O'view	II-5	2-7	It is our understanding that the IEA data are largely for industrialized countries. Further, as to the FCCC Parties, it is our understanding that the industrial or developed country Parties have obligations to provide such data, but, in the case of the many developing countries, they have been asked to provide data for 1990-1994 only. [Note that a detailed footnote is included with original comment.]					X		The text is correct as written
II-005	13	Pt II O'view	II-6 to II-7	18 to 22	This section is titled " Emissions by Month and/or State " and is largely about the U.S. We repeat that this report concerns North America, not the U.S. or states therein. According to this section, titled "Emissions by Month and/or State," there is a discussion of "energy data" and estimates of emissions for the U.S. and its states. However, even in that discussion, there are "differences." Most importantly, the section states that "we" do not "have sufficiently complete data to estimate emissions from Canada and Mexico by month or province" (presumably referring to Canada). In the absence of reliable data for the other two countries of North America, the section and the figures referred to should not single out the U.S. and, in effect, only provide data for a part of North America. We urge deletion of this section.					X		We present useful data even though it is not similarly available for all of the countries
II-006	13	Pt II O'view	II-7 to II-8 & II-8	24 to 15 & 17-54	We do not see how it is relevant to compare emissions from the three countries of North America on a per capita basis with the "Earth as a whole" and further to include "data on CO2 per capita" for only one country broken down into "50 U.S. states," when the same data are unavailable for the other countries of the region. This approach is totally misleading.					X		Granted that it would be nice if similar data were available for all countries
II-007	12	Pt II O'view	II-8	17-25	It is helpful to acknowledge the lack of consistency across chapters, but any consequent problems are not described or addressed. More important, it is reasonable to ask why inconsistencies could not be resolved in a report of this magnitude.			X				In a multiauthor compilation it seems useful to give individual experts some discretion in the treatment of their topics - but I do basically agree.

Comments and Responses on Public Review Draft of SOCCR/SAP 2.2 (September 2006)

COMMENTS FROM PUBLIC REVIEWERS						AUTHOR'S RESPONSE						
Comment Number	Reviewer ID	Chapter	Page	Line	Comment Text	Acknowledged, but no further response or revisions are required	Revisions have been incorporated as suggested in the comment	Agree, but see "Notes on Response"	Agree, but elaboration is precluded by length limitations	Disagree; see "Notes on Response"	Beyond scope of report/chapter	Notes on Response
II-008	13	Pt II O'view	II-8	17-34	We do not understand why the authors rely on IEA as a database covering "categories" that do not appear to even closely resemble the several U.S. economic sectors, particularly as established by EIA in its annual report on Emissions of Greenhouse Gases in the United States. In addition, we do not know if the authors reflect data and information for Canadian and Mexican sectors as reflected in those countries' agency reports. In the EIA report, buildings and energy extraction and conversions are not treated as sectors. If the data are not available from the EIA – which regularly and more accurately provides data on such U.S. sectors – or from Canada and Mexico, and if they are not relevant to those countries, we question the value and appropriateness of the above discussion and Table 4.					X		The point of this comment is not clear. The IEA presents widely used data that provide comparison across countries on a strictly comparable basis
II-009	12	Pt II O'view	II-12	17-20 Table 4	The total potential abatement in the Industry sector is small compared to the total abatement potential in the energy supply and transport sectors, and that mitigation of GHG emissions is best served by emphasizing energy conservation rather than implementing technology improvements in Industry.	X						see subsequent chapters of section II